

Environmental  
Restoration  
Contractor

# **ERC Team**

# **Meeting Minutes**

**Job No. 22192**  
Written Response Required: NO  
Due Date: N/A  
Actionee: N/A  
Closes CCN: N/A  
OU: GW/VZ100  
TSD: N/A  
ERA: N/A  
Subject Code: 8830/4170

**CCN: 068044**

---

**SUBJECT** GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING – APRIL 12, 1999

**TO** Distribution

**FROM** Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

**DATE** April 16, 1999

**ATTENDEES**

See Attached List

**DISTRIBUTION**

Attendees  
GW/VZ Distribution List  
Document and Information Services H0-09

---

**NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:**

\*NOTE: THE MEETING SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 19 HAS BEEN CANCELLED DUE TO A CONFLICT WITH A MEETING IN SEATTLE. (The decision is detailed in these minutes.)

Next Meeting: Monday, May 3, 1999  
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)  
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411  
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

**MEETING MINUTES:**

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on April 12, 1999 in Richland, Washington at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

**PROJECT REPORT:**

**REGULATORY PATH FORWARD WORK GROUP (Bruce Ford):**

Since the last Public meeting, the Regulatory Group has had two meetings. Generally, we concentrated on understanding the regulatory framework within the various Core Projects. We've looked at what decisions have been made and what interim decisions are faced relative to these Projects. Next we'll lay out the various decision points as a way to work out a consistent regulatory path. We are still going through background material. We've sent that background material out to the members of the work group and are in the process of getting comments back.

Our next meeting will be held this Thursday, April 15. Due to a conflict with the Hanford Advisory Board Environmental Restoration (HAB-ER) Committee, we have changed the time for the meeting from 1 p.m. to 11 a.m. The meeting will be held at BHI in Room 1B40. The plan for that meeting is to go over the comments received to date on the underlying materials and to discuss where we are at laying out the decision points.

COMMENT: Phil Staats of the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is working with all of the various project managers at Ecology. Comments are being consolidated and will be sent to Bruce Ford when compiled. Things seem to be going well on Ecology's end.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY (SAC) WORK GROUP (Bob Bryce):

The System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group last met on March 3. Last week we distributed the meeting minutes from our meeting on February 24, and hopefully we'll have the minutes for March 3 out today. Since the last meeting, there has been an extensive effort to replan the SAC task for Fiscal Year 1999 (FY99) and to finalize plans for the SAC Workshop on April 29. Mainly we've been focusing on this replan, the work we hope to accomplish in FY99, and a Long Range Plan (LRP) showing the linkages between the SAC and the other on-site projects. The people working on the Risk element within the SAC Group have developed dependency webs, and they are working on a presentation to the Tribes. Hopefully they'll be able to deliver that same briefing to everyone at the April 29 Workshop. We also plan to discuss general assessment concepts, such as how long the SAC should extend and how large a geographic area it should cover. We need to cover the pros and cons of different spatial and temporal domains and what restrictions are implied by the different approaches.

QUESTION: When can we expect to see an agenda for the April 29 Workshop?

ANSWER: We should have something prepared this week. We'll make sure that it gets sent out to the general GW/VZ Integration Project distribution list and posted on the Project website.

COMMENT: Ecology has raised some issues regarding the SAC as it ties into the overall site integration, and those comments were given to the Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). Some of the issues are things that are planned to be addressed on April 29. Are you going to meet with Ecology before then?

RESPONSE: We've not had a chance to address all of the comments yet, but yes we would like to meet with Ecology before the workshop. We should be ready to address your comments in about a week. (A meeting has been scheduled for April 22.)

QUESTION: I believe that the Risk element of the SAC Team is doing a presentation to the HAB-ER Committee this week on the SAC dependency webs. Is that the case?

ANSWER: That presentation has been deferred so that the committee can look at the bigger questions, such as who is this being done for, why, and what are the links? At this time they want information regarding the SAC that is on more of a conceptual level.

COMMENT: Also, the HAB-ER has requested that, when the assessment is done, there be at least one iteration at the beginning that is explanatory rather than numerical. They'd like something straightforward to start off with instead of jumping straight into a complex numerical model.

POLICY WORK GROUP (Dru Butler):

The Policy Work Group meeting that was scheduled this afternoon was cancelled due to insufficient items for the meeting. We decided it would be better to cancel altogether rather than having a meeting just for the sake of having a meeting. The purpose of this group is to clear the way for the other groups when they come up against a policy issue that they cannot resolve, but there are not any pressing issues at this time. Things will get more active soon with the public comment period closed for the GW/VZ Integration Project

Specification. There will be some comments that will need to go to the Policy Group for resolution. We also anticipate some issues coming from the Regulatory and SAC Work Groups in the future.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) UPDATE (Terri Stewart):

We're moving forward on S&T tasks for inventory. The group working on the SAC scoping studies is gathering inventory data, and they are working with the Risk group to identify contaminants of interest. We know from studies in the past that there are likely to be gaps of chemicals and radionuclides. We are initiating steps with the SAC group to fill those gaps. We are developing a Statement of Work to be jointly developed with the SAC and reviewed by the 200 Area and Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) Projects to catch input from all of the potential end users.

Another S&T activity at the site that is of interest to the Integration Project is the proposed Natural and Accelerated Bio-Remediation (NABIR) Field Research Center (FRC). This FRC is being supported by the DOE Office of Biological and Environmental Research (OBER). They are looking at putting the center at one of the major DOE sites, and Hanford has sent a letter of interest.

I have handed out an excerpt from a presentation (see Attachment 1) that gives a little background. The OBER is looking to use this FRC as part of a coordinated laboratory and field research effort to understand the biological and biogeochemical processes that contribute to bioremediation of DOE metals and radionuclide contaminated sites. The FRC will provide directed field research at whatever site is selected by the OBER that will have applicability to the home site, as well as other DOE sites.

Ray Wildung and Tyler Gilmore from Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) are working on the proposal for basing the FRC at Hanford. I'll let Tyler tell you the selection criteria that the OBER is using.

(Tyler Gilmore) This is basically a two step process. The first step is putting together a program-wide National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assessment. An environmental analysis is due to be submitted tomorrow for the Hanford site. Using the criteria given by the OBER, we have pinpointed the 100 H Area as the most suitable site at Hanford. One of the criteria for example was a list of contaminants, in order of priority. The 100 H Area met that criteria due to the presence of uranium and chromium. Also, the 100 H Area has a fairly shallow aquifer compared to the 200 Area, which would reduce the cost for drilling. The OBER has this set up as a 10 year program, but the proposed research and experiments are not yet defined specifically because they are looking at various sites across the country. The choice of site would effect the work performed. The basic reason for the FRC would be to look at naturally occurring microbes that could potentially aid in accumulation of wastes for cleanup activities.

The second step of the process is the submittal of scientific and technical proposals on June 1. The funding for operation of the FRC is \$3 million per year over the 10 years proposed. This money has already been allocated by the DOE Office of Science and would be above and beyond any other funding allocated to the Hanford site.

RESPONSE: The key message is that this is a potential addition of \$3 million per year to the site budget to look at the Hanford natural environment and to explore additional cleanup options. We're looking at the possible interactions between the proposed FRC and the GW/VZ Integration Project. This is another chance to bring national resources to the site and the Project.

QUESTION: Getting back to the Statement of Work, could you explain that a little more? Who defines the gaps? Is it the SAC?

ANSWER: The SAC would be the primary user, but we also recognize that the 200 Area and TWRS would have input. We are working with them to make sure we're not duplicating effort. The SAC is the primary user though, and they will help define the gaps as they go through their scoping studies.

QUESTION: Could you give an example of an Inventory task and tell what gaps it might fill or identify?

ANSWER: In doing the inventory, there are areas where we will be able to collect some current information, and we will also utilize chemical inventories of the past. As the SAC goes through their scoping studies, they will collect what is available now. As they go into development of conceptual models and scoping studies, they'll identify the contaminants and locations that they feel are most important. From studies conducted in the past, we anticipate gaps. The idea is to come up with a methodology to estimate a realistic inventory to fill those gaps using historical data and process modeling. That way we don't have to use the "worst case" estimates. This would allow the data to be more insightful and useful in a system assessment.

QUESTION: The SAC Group has not been meeting, so how do you know what you need for the Inventory task?

ANSWER: The effort will get a jump start from the SAC Workshop on April 29. Keep in mind that this is not meant to duplicate the efforts of the SAC but rather to compliment them.

QUESTION: Is there a work breakdown element in the SAC for Inventory?

ANSWER: Yes, but this isn't mean to overlap what the SAC is doing. Initially we talked about some studies by TWRS and the Agnew study as well. This effort would give us the ideas for building a process model to help understand and explain how things got distributed to different soil sites. Once completed, it would help us do a better job of estimating contaminants.

QUESTION: When you say TWRS, do you mean all of TWRS or just the tanks?

ANSWER: Just the tank farms.

QUESTION: Why is this being done by the Integration Project rather than it being the responsibility of one of the Core Projects?

ANSWER: This is Integration Project driven because of the usefulness of this effort to the SAC and because of it's applications site-wide.

COMMENT: If you're looking at some of this for helping hedge conservatism, then some of the data from Agnew would be suspect.

COMMENT: TWRS is already beyond the Agnew report by about 2 years.

RESPONSE: This group will pick up on that. This is something that needs to be agreed upon sitewide. We're not going to take anything for granted. Just because TWRS has done something beyond Agnew, doesn't mean that it is any better. There might be conservatism there too. We need to back up all the way to the data from the processing plants themselves. The data for the reactors to the processing plants was completed. Now we need to go all the way from Plutonium Uranium Reduction and Extraction (PUREX) to the tanks, waste sites, or whatever. There's still information being gathered about which waste went to which tank.

QUESTION: That's something the Tank Farm Characterization effort is working on. I'm just wondering why this is being done by the Integration Project. Why doesn't TWRS just give that work over to the GW/VZ Project?

ANSWER: If they want to transfer the scope and money to us we could take ownership.

COMMENT: It would be nice to see the logic ties to the SAC and, at a higher level, what questions the SAC is answering. It would also be helpful to look at the logic. This is new to some of us, and if we could go through some of the details, I think it would sort itself out.

COMMENT: There are definitely multiple customers for this. The SAC needs this certainly, but there are others that need this at a higher level that need inventory too. There are numerous other groups and projects that have been asking for that for a long time.

COMMENT: Also, it makes it sound like Environmental Restoration (ER) hasn't done anything about this, but that's not true. It just shows that there are some things we need to know better.

RESPONSE: This is essentially a gap analysis. Here is what we know, and here it what is missing. How do we fill it in from here? That's what we're trying to figure out.

COMMENT: People have been asking for this to be done from a system approach for years. It's been obvious that there are some sites that really need to be inventoried better. When there was a gap it was filled relative to some other gap, but it seemed that there was a key piece always missing somewhere.

COMMENT: In this logic we want to show where the gaps are and how this particular effort fills those gaps. We need to determine if we are on the same level as we think the gaps are. We'll get input from the regulators via the Regulatory Path Forward Work Group. We are currently making interim decisions based on what we do know. How does this effort fit in and who's going to use it?

COMMENT: One of the reasons why this was brought into the Project meeting so early is that we want to set a philosophy. We want to establish our desire to interact with the end-user programs to set scope that makes sense to do.

**TWRS DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE (DQO) PROCESS (David Olson):**

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation/Corrective Measures Study (RFI/CMS) for the Tank Farms is not complete yet. We have some planning sessions scheduled to go back and work some issues. It will be a week or two before the group goes through that. We need to prioritize the objectives.

The Workplan for the S/SX Waste Management Area is due to Ecology at the end of the month. This is the first interim milestone agreed to in the Tri Party Agreement (TPA) negotiations. The Workplan is in concurrent review between DOE-RL and the contractors. We're asking for a quick turn around on comments this week so that we can incorporate everything and have the plan off to Ecology at the end of the month. The plan includes the decommissioning of the 09-39 borehole and the new borehole to be drilled. The intent is to begin the work in the June/July timeframe.

QUESTION: Will the detailed workplan reflect the specific milestones for this year?

ANSWER: There are no TPA milestones this year. This will show the schedule carrying us into next year.

There is also a public meeting scheduled to be held in Hood river on Wednesday, May 12 in the Hood River Hotel Banquet Room from 7-9 p.m. Sign in will begin at 6 p.m. It's a joint effort between Salt Well Pumping and TWRS Vadose Zone Corrective Action.

The public comment period for the change package for the Corrective Action piece that came out of the TPA negotiations was supposed to end April 1, but it has been extended to May 17. To date we have received no comments. We hope this meeting will stimulate people to comment.

QUESTION: Was this a requested meeting?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Is this the only meeting planned? I thought there was something said about having two meetings.

ANSWER: This is the only meeting planned.

COMMENT: The meeting is being held on the same day that the Washington Advisory Group (WAG) is going to be at Hanford, so you might have limited attendance from the Integration Project. Our attendance is probably not crucial though. It's more focused on issues for the Office of River Protection (ORP).

RESPONSE: It was necessary to schedule this as soon as possible to allow people time to submit comments if they wish.

EXPERT PANEL (Virginia Rohay):

The Expert Panel has submitted a Closeout Report for the meeting held in February. It has been posted on the Project website (<http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>) in the Peer Review section. If you do not have access to the web and you would like to get a copy, you may contact Gary Jewell at (509) 372-9192.

The next meeting of the Panel will be May 13-15. That is a Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. The meeting will be here at BHI in the Assembly Room. I am currently working the agenda for that meeting with the Panel chairman, Dr. Edgar Berkey, and I will have that available next week.

The Data Gathering and Field Investigations Sub-Panel met on March 22 and 23. Their focus was on the S/SX preliminary workplan to give their input on the work proposed for this summer.

The Peer Review Sub-Panel met on March 24. It was really an initial effort to find what peer review is planned for the GW/VZ Integration Project in the future. Both sub-panels will be writing reports and giving them to the full Panel. The reports will then come to us as appendices to the May meeting's Closeout Report. That is how submittal of sub-panel reports has been structured by the Expert Panel.

QUESTION: Is a review and report from the sub-panels going to be a part of the agenda?

ANSWER: The Panel will do that internally. It's possible they may even have it done before they get here. We won't get the Panel's official word until they give us the Closeout Report.

QUESTION: It could be conceivably June or July before you get that. The obvious question would be how does that help TWRS or Ecology with the S/SX Workplan?

ANSWER: That was an issue, and we are hoping that we can get at least get a draft copy of the sub-panel report early enough to be helpful. The sub-panel isn't planning a detailed technical review of the workplan and we're not expecting that. Their role is more of oversight. The Panel expressed their views during the sub-panel meeting, and they provided closing comments at the end of the meeting, both of which were helpful.

Some of the members of the Project will be meeting next week with Expert Panel member Jim Karr in Seattle to discuss risk and dependency webs. We are having discussions to hold a Risk Sub-Panel here in Richland at the end of April. This was just a chance to talk to him since we were going to be in Seattle for the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Symposium. The official sub-panel meeting would be when he comes here.

If any of you or a member of your organization will be in Seattle next week, please call Dru Butler at (509) 375-4669 if you would like to participate. This meeting is open to anyone, but I want reiterate that this discussion is just a chance for the Project to talk to him in person and get his input on the Risk Sub-Panel and a few other issues. The official meeting would be the Risk Sub-Panel in Richland at the end of April or early May. The representatives from the Project that will be in Seattle are Dru, Pam Doctor, and Rich Holten.

QUESTION: Do you have a time and location?

ANSWER: Not yet. He has committed to meet with us, but we are still working out the particulars. If you are interested in being a part of the meeting please let Dru know. (The meeting will be at 5:30 p.m. at the Westin in Seattle on April 19.)

QUESTION: When is the new Risk Sub-Panel scheduled to meet?

ANSWER: The tentative date is April 30, but that's not solid yet. We are using that as a target date. It could be May 5 or 6. We'll send out a notification and post it on the website calendar as soon as it's finalized. (The date has been set for April 30.)

**QUESTION:** Could we go back to the Hood River meeting for a moment? The discussion about the Expert Panel and the workplan made me think of something. Is the expectation from the people attending Hood River to hear about the entire change package and how it effects the plans themselves, or is it to talk about details of the workplan? It makes a big difference if you say here's the change package with the things we will do, and by the way, here's something we did in parallel. Are you planning to talk about both, or will you focus on one or the other?

**ANSWER:** That's still sketchy. The meeting is still in the planning stages. This meeting is headed by Ecology, and DOE-RL will be there in a support capacity. DOE-RL has no plans at this point for an elaborate presentation.

**HAB ER COMMITTEE (Dru Butler):**

Originally we were going to speak about the dependency web approach to risk, but it looks now like we're going to be there more to listen. We'll talk a little bit about the SAC and about the Expert Panel report. There's not a lot of time on the agenda to talk. This session is for the committee to do work, and they want us there for the sake of discussion. Is that correct?

**RESPONSE:** (Gordon Rogers) That's correct. We are interested in hearing the Expert Panel expectations that came out of the sub-panels and your responses to those expectations. The main thing we need to establish though is where the ER Committee is now in relation to this Project, where we want to be, and what we should be doing to get there. The same things are required of the regulators. I perceive a complete disinterest in the SAC work, at least in the near term, by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**COMMENT:** Tom Post from EPA will be at the HAB-ER meeting for a small presentation. It would be a good time to voice your feelings and comments.

**OTHER MEETINGS:**

**COMMENT:** (Mike Thompson) On April 28, the National Academy of Science (NAS) will have a group here looking at soil cleanup levels and stewardship; things like what land end uses would be and how it's all intertwined. This same group was here in November, and they are coming out now for an update. We're starting to get ideas of the subjects for discussion, but there is no agenda as of yet. We'll get it out on the web and to the Project distribution list when we have it.

**COMMENT:** Please do not confuse this group with the NAS involvement for the Integration Project. These are two separate animals. This is a continuation of another NAS effort.

**QUESTION:** Has there been any formal response from the group that was here last fall?

**ANSWER:** Apparently there is a draft report in the mail, but we haven't seen anything yet.

**COMMENT:** (Rob Yasek) Another meeting on the horizon is the ITRD TechCon Forum on Reducing Surface Infiltration Around the Hanford Tanks on May 4-6. There should be an agenda this week. Please contact Rob Yasek of DOE-RL if you are interested in attending at (509) 375-6485. Also, TechCon has a website for this at <http://web1.ead.anl.gov/techcon/projects/hanford/tanks>.



QUESTION: What is this meeting?

ANSWER: It's sponsored by TechCon and is TPA milestone driven. It's a presentation of technologies that could be used to reduce surface infiltration or monitor moisture around the tanks.

**NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING (Dru Butler):**

There is a bit of a scheduling conflict with next Monday's meeting. It occurs on the same day as the ASTM Symposium on Environmental Toxicology and Risk in Seattle. Many of the people in this room will be in Seattle for that. Do we still want to hold this meeting, or should we cancel?

ANSWER: It would be best to cancel the Project meeting.

COMMENT: If you're not holding this meeting, then you should get out these various agendas for all of the upcoming meetings.

COMMENT: Even if the meeting is canceled, there is still the SAC Workshop on April 29, so it's not like there won't be a Project event in the near future.

COMMENT: I hear us committing to providing agendas for NAS, Expert Panel, and SAC Workshop, as well as agenda and scheduling information for the new Risk Sub-Panel.

RESPONSE: Also, Rich Holten mentioned setting up a meeting with Ecology before the SAC Workshop.

COMMENT: If there are no disagreements on providing the updates and agenda instead of the meeting, then we'll adjourn.

**UPCOMING EVENTS:**

(See attached Look Ahead Calendar)

**NOTES:**

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669), Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or Karen Strickland (509-372-9236)

**ACTIONS:**

- Schedule meeting with Ecology regarding SAC comments (Scheduled for April 22)
- Distribute agenda for April 28 NAS meeting on stewardship issues
- Distribute agenda for April 29 SAC Workshop
- Distribute schedule and agenda for April 30 Expert Panel Risk Sub-Panel
- Distribute agenda for May 13-15 Expert Panel Meeting

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) Excerpts from NABIR Field Research Center Presentation
- 2) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Bob Boutin, BHI  
Bob Bryce, PNNL  
Dru Butler, BHI  
Greg deBruler, CRU  
Bruce Ford, BHI  
Tyler Gilmore, PNNL  
Dib Goswami, Ecology  
Jim Hanson, DOE-RL  
Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ  
Barbara Harper, YIN  
Dave Holland, Ecology  
Rich Holten, DOE-RL  
Michael Hughes, BHI  
Gary Jewell, BHI  
Fred Mann, FDNW  
Lynne Marty, BHI  
David Olson, DOE-RL  
Wade Riggsbee, YIN  
Gordon Rogers, HAB  
Virginia Rohay, BHI  
Ron Skinnarland, Ecology  
Terri Stewart, PNNL  
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL  
Ray Wildung, PNNL  
John Williams, FDH  
Rob Yasek, DOE-RL

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **Excerpts from NABIR Field Research Center Presentation**

#### Background/Purpose

- DOE's Office of Biological and Environmental Research (OBER) proposes a Field Research Center (FRC) as part of a coordinated laboratory and field research effort to understand the biological and biogeochemical processes that contribute to bioremediation of DOE's metals and radionuclide contaminated sites
- The FRC will provide directed field research at Hanford (or selected site) but with applicability to other DOE sites

#### Benefits

- Long-term solutions to metals and radionuclide contamination at DOE sites (including Hanford)
- Supports the Hanford Cleanup mission
- Augments current DOE research conducted at Hanford
- \$3M/year over 10 years (already allocated by DOE-SC)

#### Linkages to Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project

- Vadose Zone work in Hanford Formation will benefit from research performed at proposed FRC site.
- Other GW/VZ programs could leverage characterization effort
  - River studies
  - "Representative sites"
  - 100 H cleanup effort

#### Schedule

- |                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| • Intent to apply                | February 9 |
| • Environmental Analysis         | April 13   |
| • Scientific/Technical Proposals | June 1     |
| • Award                          | October 1  |

**ATTACHMENT 2**

*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*  
**APRIL 19, 1999 – JUNE 10, 1999**  
*TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*

<b>April 19</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
<b>April 19-21</b>	Environmental Toxicology & Risk Assessment-Environmental Fate and Transport Symposium, ASTM (Seattle)
<b>April 22</b>	STCG Sub-Con Subgroup Science Workshop (Richland)
<b>April 22</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>April 28</b>	NAS group at Hanford to discuss soil cleanup levels and stewardship (BHI)
<b>April 29</b>	System Assessment Capability Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-5 p.m.)
<b>April 29</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>April 30</b>	GW/VZ Expert Panel Risk Sub-Panel (BHI Assembly Room)
<b>May 3</b>	GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)
<b>May 3</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
<b>May 4-6</b>	TechCon/ITRD Forum on Reducing Surface Infiltration Around the Hanford Tanks (The Conference Center – 451 Hills St., Richland) Contact: Rob Yasek
<b>May 6</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>May 11-13</b>	<i>Washington Advisory Group Meetings (Richland, Location to be determined)</i>
<b>May 13</b>	<i>HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)</i>
<b>May 13-15</b>	GW/VZ Expert Panel meetings (5/13 – Shilo Inn, Richland – 5/14 & 15 – BHI Assembly Room)
<b>May 17</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 1 p.m.)
<b>May 20</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>May 27</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>June 3-4</b>	Hanford Advisory Board Meeting (Ridpath Hotel, Spokane)
<b>June 7</b>	GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)
<b>June 7</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
<b>June 10</b>	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)

***PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS***

<b>April 30</b>	Performance Objectives for the Hanford Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) Performance Assessment and Scenarios for the Hanford ILAW Performance Assessment public comment period ends
-----------------	--